

III. REMARKS

Applicant has considered the current Office Action with mailing date of March 6, 2008.

Claims 1 - 17 are pending in this application. By this amendment, claims 1, 6, 10 and 14 have been amended. Applicants are not conceding in this application that those claims are not patentable over the art cited by the Office. Applicant does not acquiesce in the correctness of the rejections and reserves the right to present specific arguments regarding any rejected claims not specifically addressed. Further, Applicant respectfully reserves the right to pursue the full scope of the subject matter of these original claims and other claims in one or more subsequent patent application that claim(s) priority to the instant application. Reconsideration in view of the following remarks is respectfully requested.

In the Office Action, claims 6 – 8 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Applicant's Allegedly Admitted Prior Art (AAPA) in view of Beadle et al. (US Pat. No. 6,766,373), hereinafter "Beadle". Claims 1 – 5 and 9 – 17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Applicant's Allegedly Admitted Prior Art (APPA) in view of Beadle and Tyrell, III (US Pat. No. 7,062,527), hereinafter "Tyrell".
Applicant submits the following arguments in support of current amendments in the claims for the Office's consideration.

With respect to the 35 U.S.C. §103(a) rejection of claims 6-8, Applicants submit that AAPA and Beadle do not teach each and every limitation of the claimed invention. Applicant continues to dispute that Paragraph [0002] (cited by the Office as Admitted Prior Art) of the claimed invention discloses any element of the claimed invention. The Office, in the Response to Arguments section, states that Para. [0002] was relied upon to teach the limitation of: "wherein the adding is performed through a separate web application having a sole duty to serve

the JAVA resources.” Office Action, p. 6. However, as the Office acknowledges, Para. [0002] of the specification simply states that in prior systems, “when a particular web application receives new class files, it invalidates, and therefore loses, all its current session information.” The Office states that since Para. [0002] states that it is the web application that receives new class files, it would have been obvious that this addition is performed thru a separate web application. Applicant respectfully disagrees. Para. [0002] is simply stating a problem noted by the inventors, which is solved by the disclosed invention by using, *inter alia*, a separate web application to serve the resources. Para. [0002] does not disclose using such a separate web application, instead, it explains the consequences of not using a separate web application, *i.e.*, session information is lost. Therefore, it would not have been obvious to one of skill in the art, reading Para. [0002], to use a separate, dedicated, web application to serve the resource.

Applicant further asserts that the combination of Beadle with Para. [0002] does not cure the deficiencies noted above. In the Response to Arguments section, the Office states that “Applicant has not claimed the “solution” as asserted in the arguments.” Office Action, p. 6. Applicant again respectfully disagrees. As the amended claims clarify, the claimed invention uses a separate web application (the resource lookup web application) as an intermediary between the web application that will ultimately receive the resource (the original web application), and the resource. This separate resource lookup web application serves the resource and provides the resource to the original web application. In this way, the resource is added indirectly to the web application, and therefore session information is not lost, as it would have been if the resource was added directly to the application (as disclosed in Para. [0002]).

With respect to the 35 U.S.C. §103(a) rejection of claims 1-5 and 9-17, Applicants submit that, as discussed above, AAPA and Beadle do not teach each and every limitation of the claimed invention. In addition, Tyrell does not cure the deficiencies of AAPA and Beadle. Neither of the three references, singly or in combination, teach the limitation, present in all independent claims, that resources are obtained indirectly from a separate web application which acts as an intermediary, whose only duty is to serve Java resources. Since the Office is unable to find pertinent references as prior art that teaches the claimed features, the Office has not established a *prima facie* case of obviousness. As such, Applicant respectfully request that the Office withdraw this rejection and allow the claims.

IV. CONCLUSION

In addition to the above arguments, Applicant submits that each of the pending claims is patentable for one or more additional unique features. To this extent, Applicant does not acquiesce to the Office's interpretation of the claimed subject matter or the references used in rejecting the claimed subject matter. Additionally, Applicant does not acquiesce to the Office's combinations and modifications of the various references or the motives cited for such combinations and modifications. These features and the appropriateness of the Office's combinations and modifications have not been separately addressed herein for brevity. However, Applicant reserves the right to present such arguments in a later response should one be necessary.

In light of the above, Applicant respectfully submits that all claims are in condition for allowance. Should the Examiner require anything further to place the application in better

condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to contact Applicant's undersigned representative at the number listed below.

Respectfully submitted,

Meghan Q. Toner/
Meghan Q. Toner
Reg. No. 52,142

Dated: June 5, 2008

Hoffman, Warnick & D'Alessandro LLC
75 State Street, 14 Floor
Albany, NY 12207
Telephone: (518) 449-0044
Fax: (518) 449-0047